

25X1

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

October 1968

MEXICAN STUDENT DISORDERS

A series of student disorders that broke out in Mexico on 26 July may eventually be transformed into a significant mass movement with broad political implications. The violence that broke out in downtown Mexico City on 26 July occurred after several hundred Communist youth, who were celebrating the anniversary of the Cuban revolution, merged with a separate, larger student group that had received permission to protest police intervention in a technical students' demonstration a few days earlier.

According to the Mexican government, the Communists took over the merged group and there followed three days of rioting and destruction which ended with the calling up of army troops and, in what is generally agreed as over-reaction on the part of government, the use of harsh, repressive measures against the students. School buildings were broken into to flush out the more rebellious students and there was a widely publicized incident of a bazooka being fired into the doorway of a preparatory school. Many students were hurt and many were arrested, including a number of known leftists. The police reportedly raided the office of the Mexican Communist Party where they confiscated propaganda aimed at inciting students to riot. However, rather than quelling the student unrest, the army and riot squad action led to the organization of some 150,000 university and preparatory school students into a strike movement that was effective in closing schools and university facilities.

Following the riots of late July, the security forces were instructed to allow the students to demonstrate and march without interference, probably in the hope that the students would tire of their cause and return to their studies. But instead of easing off, the students staged two huge, though peaceful, demonstrations, one of some 150,000 on 13 August and another of an estimated 200,000 on 27 August, when they occupied the main square and the national cathedral of Mexico City and raised the black and red flag of anarchy in place of the Mexican flag. Many Mexicans formerly sympathetic to the students were reported to have been offended by this demonstration and by the unprecedented personal and vulgar attacks made on the President. Following several violent clashes between students and security forces on the day after the second huge rally, the government once again decided to use whatever force was necessary to restore order and the violence soon abated. At the time of the second rally, however, there was evident uneasiness in Mexico City in the public confusion and panic buying that followed rumors of short supplies of food and gasoline. Following publication of an open, insulting letter, from the students' strike committee to the President, which also threatened to disrupt the Olympics, the President ordered military occupation of the National University on 18 September, thereby carrying out his promise to use force to maintain order. Javier Barros Sierra, the university rector, has resigned in protest against what he termed an "excessive act of force." More violence has followed, including one all-night gun battle, that has resulted in some dozen or more student deaths and more arrests of students, teachers and sympathizers. Whatever interludes of calm prevail are at best uneasy.

Student and Government Positions

The students have felt that the government has been unresponsive to their demands, which are now codified in six points set forth by the National Strike Council, the group that acts on the students' behalf. It is made up of several factions, including left-extremists, and is advised by a group of prominent leftist professors and intellectuals. The six points include: freedom for "political prisoners"; repeal of the subversion law; elimination of riot squads; firing of the top Mexico City police officials; indemnity to "victims and survivors of police and army brutality"; and punishment of officials who "unconstitutionally intervened in this conflict."

In his annual state of the union message on 1 September, President Diaz Ordaz expressed the need to keep dissidence within legal bounds and declared that excesses would not be tolerated. He reaffirmed the principle of university autonomy and denied it had been violated during the riots. He ignored many of the student demands while making some concessions. Although he disclaimed any knowledge of cases involving "political prisoners," he offered to free immediately any such persons whose cases might be brought to his attention. He suggested congressional hearings on possible changes in Article 145 of the criminal code which defines the crime of "social dissolution" under which so-called political prisoners are held, and these hearings have apparently already started.

The student groups, now divided between "moderates" and "militants" over prolonging the strike, rejected the government's response to their demands, and on 13 September they held a silent protest march which attracted a reported 75,000-100,000 participants, or about half the number that marched in the August demonstrations. There were no incidents of disorder and no interference by security forces. President Diaz Ordaz has made it unmistakably clear he would use all legal means to stop public disorders or any attempts to sabotage the Olympic Games, scheduled to open on 12 October.

The One-Party System

Although the political establishment of Mexico has been unnerved by these riots, the student sector would need widespread support, including the labor and peasant sectors, to pose a serious threat to the nation's stability. To date these groups have given no indication of active sympathetic support, although there have been recent indications that some slum dwellers have joined the students' cause. Both labor and peasants are politically unsophisticated, compared to the student groups, and both form important segments of the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) within which they are closely controlled.

The PRI has ruled Mexico since the 1910 revolution, has successfully provided for smooth transitions of power and for reconciling conflicting economic interests of various population sectors. Nevertheless, it has

become monolithic and monopolistic, and since the students represent a more sophisticated and non-conformist group, they have become impatient with the rate of progress and have periodically rebelled. They feel the PRI has long since ceased to be "revolutionary," has not kept pace with the times and is too much in the shadow of its large powerful neighbor to the north. They point out that only token opposition parties are allowed to exist and these are denied any meaningful political life through all possible means, including fraudulent election practices. They also complain of the government's methods in the areas of press censorship and the administration of justice. Now, in addition, many students view the PRI as a vehicle of repression and intolerance, although President Diaz Ordaz himself is considered a political moderate who stands for legality and peaceful interplay of political forces.

Issue of University Autonomy

Part of the resentment against the allegedly unnecessary brutality by the police and armed forces is based on the issue of university autonomy, a firmly established principle in Latin American universities by which virtually all prerogatives in university academic and administrative matters are reserved to a governing council, made up of student, faculty and graduate representatives, and which gives the university freedom from governmental interference. These factors, together with the role of the university as a melting pot for the formation of political ideas, have led students to consider it as a privileged sanctuary. In recent years, however, a number of Latin American governments have not hesitated to limit the extent of university autonomy, when it was believed necessary, in order to end student-inspired violence. The Mexican government has taken the position that autonomy is neither the same as extra-territoriality nor does it mean that a school and its students are free from law enforcement.

The university system is largely a result of the reform movement, aimed at democratization of the university, that began in 1918 in Cordoba, Argentina, from which it subsequently spread throughout most of Latin America. The system of higher education that developed from the Cordoba reform has generally failed to meet the needs of Latin American society since academic standards are low, administration is too decentralized and ineffective, there is a continuing lack of trained personnel and funds to meet the needs of the growing student body and a sense of academic community is non-existent. In the case of the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), faculty members admit that it offers a low level of education and operates with a low budget, resulting in inadequate laboratories, technical equipment and teaching resources. Of the faculty numbering 7,000 in 1967, only 145 were full-time and 150 half-time. The rest were professional people who volunteered as instructors when they could.

In addition to its essential nature as a protest against professors' incompetence and obsolete curricula, the Cordoba movement represented a

type of nationalistic urge to escape European influence and develop specifically Latin American universities. This, combined with increasing social tensions over the years, has encouraged a tradition of revolt against established authority and has led students to consider themselves as the vanguard of reform. The Mexican students feel that the revolutionary -- and left-leaning -- tradition of such leaders as Zapata, Villa and Cardenas died in the Aleman administration of 1946-1952, and that the reactionary banking, industrial and commercial interests run the country, with little concern for the peasants, the unskilled workers and the students.

Communists' Role

While the students of Latin America are generally leftist in their views and their university system facilitates Communist infiltration and domination, much of what is frequently labelled as Communist is often a nationalistic manifestation against foreign economic and political influence. Yet, like the young intelligentsia of other Latin American countries, Mexican students have long been a major target for Communist subversion. Widespread political and social unrest, combined with the system of university autonomy, has facilitated Communist efforts to exploit the highly vocal and susceptible student sector. Extreme leftists have been able to pose as champions of nationalistic solutions to problems of overriding interest to the student body, and have repeatedly succeeded in drawing support to their cause on these specific issues. Also, Communist success among students has often been the result of more effective organization in situations where democratic forces have been disunited or apathetic.

In spite of the Mexican government's public accusation of Communist elements backed by the Soviet and Cuban embassies, as the instigators of the disturbances, it was clear that many of the student participants were not under Communist control and that a majority did not participate in the demonstrations. While it is fairly certain that members of the group celebrating Castro's revolution on 26 July did manage to take over the larger student demonstration that had been authorized by the government, the importance of the role subsequently played by Communist elements in the disturbances is not clear, nor is the degree of involvement of the Soviet or Cuban embassies. It is certain that besides the known Communists involved in the agitation, numerous extreme leftist groups, including among others Trotskyites, Maoists and followers of Guevara, helped to ignite the protest and to keep it alive by capitalizing on such emotion packed issues as police brutality and violation of university autonomy.

Conclusion

Whether the student rebellion will, in effect, become a genuine political movement, will be determined by future developments. There are rumors that an organizational meeting will be held the end of

Approved For Release 2005/08/17 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000400030020-4
16 September 1968

The Student Revolt in Mexico

By DANIEL JAMES

Mexico City.

A Mexican President's state-of-the-union message, delivered before Congress annually as in the United States, is usually a routine speech largely filled with facts and figures on national progress and of interest primarily to business men, economists and politicians. Since the date, September 1, is declared a national holiday, the average Mexican doesn't bother listening to his President but goes off somewhere to relax.

This year it was different. "Juan Puehlo"—as John Q. Public is known here—stayed at home glued to his radio or TV set anxiously fastening onto the President's every word. Of course the President, Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, made the usual fact-filled report on the year's progress—and impressive it was in most respects—but that was not what the people waited to hear. What interested them was only the final quarter of the three-hour speech, for in it Diaz Ordaz dealt with the country's newest and scariest problem: a series of student disturbances which had rocked this capital until the eve of his message.

The world-wide student revolt had finally reached Mexico, and since its outbreak in late July the nation had been gripped by fear and alarm unknown in its recent history. The Government itself, normally composed, sometimes became very jittery as student demonstrations involving hundreds of thousands of participants threatened to disrupt this capital's life completely—much as their French counterparts had disrupted Paris last May.

The worst of it was that it had happened at the most inopportune moment: the eve of the XIX Olympic Games, which are scheduled to open here October 12.

Until July 26, the date of the first violent clash, Mexico had generally been considered a Gibraltar of social, political and economic stability. She was the envy not only of sister Latin American nations but also of those in Asia and Africa as well. For that matter, apart from perhaps Switzerland and the Scandinavian countries, no European country was able to match

Mexico's record for stability. And it was a stability, moreover, combined with phenomenal economic progress.

Then, suddenly, on July 26 Mexico was shattered out of its complacency by a series of violent student riots that, save for brief lulls, continued into July 31.

The riots ranged over the political and commercial heart of the capital, in the downtown area surrounding the well-known Zócalo—the Indian name given to the huge Plaza de la Constitución—where the National Palace and other Government buildings, the Metropolitan Cathedral, and numerous stores, offices, banks and other business enterprises are located.

The youthful rioters seized and burned buses and frequently used them to barricade themselves in given blocks, hurled rocks at shops, office buildings and passenger autos, and fought police with Molotov cocktails, stones, and lengths of steel pipe. At one point, they nearly succeeded in raiding a gunshop—but that disaster was narrowly averted.

On July 29, a conference of the Minister of Interior, Attorney General and city mayor decided that the police could no longer cope with the mounting violence and disorder, and called out the Army. Eight infantry battalions, a motorized squadron and a paratrooper unit were thrown into action.

That same day saw the worst rioting on record. Students seized an area of several blocks around the Plaza Ciudadela, around which are a cluster of preparatory schools, and barricaded themselves in. Soldiers forcibly entered some of the prep schools, and are said to have blasted their way into one of them with a bazooka.

Next day Mexican citizens and foreign residents and tourists could not believe their eyes when they saw soldiers in battle dress with bayonets fixed patrolling the beautiful tree-lined Paseo de la Reforma, the boulevard modeled after the Champs Elysees, and armored cars and other military vehicles rumbling about the Zócalo and other key points. Nothing like it had been seen in a generation or more.

What had caused the student eruption? Nearly everyone here confesses to ignorance of the precise origins. All that is known is that the violence itself began not with students ranged against the Establishment, as elsewhere, but against other students! On July 22, rival student groups from a vocational and a preparatory school clashed. Next day, further fighting between them broke out and the *granaderos*—Mexico City's special riot police armed with tear-gas grenades—intervened to prevent them from maiming and killing each other.

Inevitably, the police committed excesses, bruised some heads and bodies, and with that students all over town took up the cry: "police brutality!"

The vocational students' parent body, the National Federation of Technical Students (FNET) connected with the National Polytechnical Institute, decided to organize a protest for July 26. July 26, as it happens, marked the fifteenth anniversary of Fidel Castro's assault on Moncada Barracks in Santiago, Cuba, which initiated his revolutionary career and produced the July 26 Movement. To commemorate the event, the Mexican Communist party, the Juventud Comunista—its youth arm—and like-minded groups of Castro sympathizers planned a rally in the Alameda—the capital's "Central Park."

As the FNET describes what happened, in a formal statement it issued on July 29, its own demonstration was infested with "extremist groups which devoted themselves systematically to sabotaging" it, and specifically cited "recognized Trotskyites." These elements "incited a group of students"—estimated to number about 500—to join the pro-Castro July 26 meeting and "led them into a clash with the police."

All told, an estimated 188 student rioters were detained by police and hundreds of others interrogated. Most have been released, but some—the number is unknown—are still being held and are under indictment.

What has been the objective of the Communists in helping stir up

Approved For Release 2005/08/17 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000400030020-4

The primary immediate alternative, it is almost unanimously agreed, was to try to prevent the Olympic Games from being held. Had the violence continued, the Games might well have been canceled, for the rules of the International Olympic Committee state that they may not be held if, some 40 days before their scheduled opening, there is disorder in the host country.

Cancellation would have been a severe blow at Mexico's world prestige and, of more tangible importance, at her pocketbook. The country has some \$2 billion invested in the Olympics, the loss of which might have wrecked her budget. Add to that further losses in income from tourists and investors scared off by repeated violence, and one can see that the Communists were aiming at nothing less than Mexico's economic solar plexus.

But it would be erroneous to attribute the student violence entirely to the Trotskyites, Guevaraites, Maoists and other shades of Communists. The issue of "police brutality" galvanized many thousands of apolitical students into an angry

the even more electric issue of violation of university autonomy when Army troops, on July 29, broke into several schools and occupied them.

University autonomy—the right of institutions of higher learning to run their academic and administrative affairs without interference from the state—has been a sacred cow in Mexico since it was achieved in 1929. It is so not only to the 90,000 students of the National Autonomous University of Mexico and the approximately 50,000 of the Polytechnical Institute, but also to professors, to alumni, and to nearly everybody who is anybody here.

Thus the "revolt" has now become a political movement. Indeed, seventeen different student and alumni groups have decided to form a new "youth party," and have scheduled an "assembly of the new fatherland" for September 26-28 to found it.

Thus is exposed a serious undercurrent of discontent—fairly general discontent, one may add—behind the student movement, which goes

it and the exploitation of it by the various Communist groups.

President Diaz Ordaz stated in his annual message to Congress that the Olympic Games will be held, and few doubt they will be. The scheduled October 12 opening remains as is, plans are moving ahead for two weeks of athletic and cultural events, and visitors from all over the world are already arriving.

It is as certain as anything can be that there will be no violence during that period, and probably not even a peaceful and orderly student demonstration. After one that is scheduled for September 11 calling for a "dialogue" with the Government, a moratorium will probably be declared until after the Olympics.

In any case, a stern-faced Mexican President has warned that he will exercise whenever strictly necessary the powers vested in him to call out the armed forces under Article 89 of the Constitution, to insure "internal security."

Saturday Review
17 August 1968

LATIN AMERICA

REBELS WITHOUT ALLIES

By LUIGI EINAUDI, staff member, The RAND Corporation, and lecturer in political science, the University of California at Los Angeles.

TWO months ago, street clashes between students and police erupted in five Argentine cities. In Buenos Aires the fumes of molotov cocktails and tear gas bombs mingled to produce the heady atmosphere of revolution and repression. A nationwide boycott of classes to protest the imposition of new university regulations by the government of General Juan Carlos Ongania had also culminated in numerous injuries and arrests the week before.

"Like the Revolutionary Youth of France we are fighting for workers' and people's unity," read one banner carried by student demonstrators along Avenida Córdoba. Unlike their counterparts in France or the United States, however, Argentine students and their similarly active peers elsewhere in Latin America

were responding to a specific tradition that identifies them as the guardians of social ideals against the compromises of the past and the partisanship of special interests. Such a heritage must be acted upon. Said one militant about the demonstrations of June 1968, "No one can accuse us of being bureaucratic about the 50th anniversary of the University Reform."

Precisely fifty years earlier, in mid-June 1918, students at Córdoba, Argentina's oldest university, had proclaimed that universities throughout Latin America had become "faithful images of our decadent societies, sad spectacles of senile immobility." In rapid succession they denounced their professors as intellectual invalids, their libraries and research facilities as notable chiefly for their absence, and their curricula as "characterized by a narrow dogmatism which contributes to the insulation of the university from science and modern learning." The remedy—to become in

time the central tenet of the University Reform Movement—was student participation in the administration of the university. Proponents of reform argued that this would introduce to the cloistered "havens of mediocrity" a hunger for contemporary knowledge as well as a sensitivity to the needs of a more just society.

The movement spread rapidly through Latin America's cosmopolitan elite, and adaptations of the Córdoba Manifesto had affected most countries within the decade. Article 143 of the 1945 Ecuadorian Constitution, for instance, described the *reformista* utopia: "The universities are autonomous . . . and will particularly attend to the study and resolution of national problems and the spread of culture among the popular classes."

EVER since the founding of the first "Royal and Pontifical" universities in Peru and Mexico in 1551, a few large institutions have dominated higher ed-

Approved For Release 2005/08/17 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000400030020-4

education in Latin America. As the continent emerged from colonial status, independence reaffirmed the power of the state over the church, but did not notably increase the relevance of the universities to their environments. Around monastic patios in aging buildings, virtually autonomous faculties offered instruction in the learned professions, with little general education and almost no postgraduate training. For the most part, neither students nor professors were present full-time, and the irrelevance of the university to modern learning was matched only by its penury. It is small wonder that by 1918 the students were demanding reform—sometimes violently.

The intervening fifty years have brought substantial changes in some areas, but striking continuities remain, many of them inherent in Latin American conditions. At the University of Havana in 1960, for instance, students issued a critique reminiscent of the Córdoba Manifesto. In a startling juxtaposition, which nonetheless beautifully conveyed the emotions of the moment, they concluded by denouncing the university authorities as "the great landowners of culture." Harassed administrators admitted many deficiencies, but pointed out that the nearby University of Puerto Rico, certainly not a wealthy institution by U.S. standards, had nearly ten times the income per student. As this example implies, problems of higher education are enormously complicated by political pressures. If the universities have often been marginal in fulfilling educational and social needs, they have nearly always been central to politics.

Viewed from the United States, this has all seemed pretty chaotic. Latin America has to most North Americans long symbolized political instability and student riots. In the wake of recent events in the United States, however, these matters now seem less exotic. Previously complacent American university administrators are rumored to have sought professional advice from their Latin American colleagues on the best means of coping with student activism and violence. Nor have worried conservatives been the only ones struck by seeming parallels. An old friend remarked recently that he was saddened by the appearance on American campuses of undercover police agents disguised as students, a phenomenon with which he and I had first become acquainted in Latin America in the mid-1950s. Are American universities becoming increasingly Latin Americanized? The students of the United States—and their French colleagues—certainly seem bent upon shaking their universities and societies to the very foundations.

Ironically, this agitation in the northern hemisphere comes at a time when students in Latin America have been relatively quiescent. Despite recent demonstrations, today's activists are less prominent than their predecessors who, a decade ago, played key roles in the chain of political upheavals which began with the fall of Perón in Argentina, continued through the assassination, resignation, or overthrow of dictators in Nicaragua, Peru, Venezuela, and Colombia, and culminated with the collapse of Batista in Cuba. Even the student guerrillas of three or four years ago are less and less common. Can it be that while we are becoming more Latin Americanized, they are becoming more Americanized?

PARTLY, of course, the paradox is a false one. The idea that political violence and mob demonstrations are as much a part of the rites of passage for Latin American students as were panty raids for American students is a hasty generalization. Most studies of Latin American student opinion and behavior suggest that they are neither particularly radical nor particularly active. But this also describes Berkeley and Columbia. The inactivity of most does not, we know, prevent others from playing major roles in the political turmoil of their respective societies. What is really wrong with our apparent paradox is that it omits consideration of the traditions and roles of institutions and persons acting under very different historical circumstances.

Latin American universities, though they have multiplied in recent years and assumed greater superficial similarities to U.S. institutions, have little in common with the American university tradition. Fundamental differences are often masked for casual observers by similarities in the physical expression of grievances leading to violent conflicts on university grounds. Youthful *élan*, the economic and personal freedom implicit in minimal family responsibilities, and student quickness to perceive the disparities between social ideals and performance all combine nearly everywhere to produce a potential for demonstrations that occasionally erupt beyond the sanctuary of the universities and strike with sudden violence at the societies themselves. Confrontations between students and police, mediated or activated by various third parties—including administrators, faculty, and politicians—inevitably follow common patterns and are often provoked by similar immediate issues.

THIS increasingly familiar script should not be allowed to obscure the fact

that Latin American universities have historically contributed more to the social exclusiveness of ruling elites than to the education of the new skilled masses of industrial society. Although the number of university students in Latin America has doubled in the past decade, allowing for differences in size of population and age groups, the United States still has more than a dozen times as many students. This actually understates the difference, since many more American students receive degrees than do Latin American students.

Latin American universities have traditionally provided the urban political leadership for largely agrarian societies. Unable to control fully the generous impulses of youthful idealism toward solidarity with those whose exclusion the elitism of the university was helping to perpetuate, this system occasionally led to explosions which, like the medieval peasant Jacquerie, made a great deal of noise but signified nothing. The major coherent challenge to this pre-modern system, the University Reform Movement, was essentially a protest which assumed the inability of students to communicate with the general population but hoped to modernize society through the use of governmental authority.

Students attending public universities in societies with expanding government bureaucracies have at their disposal the means for influencing government policies at a much earlier stage than would be true in the United States. Ministers of education are exposed targets for student protests which can thus be translated almost automatically into cabinet instability. Strikes may also affect the functioning of public agencies in which students are working while attending classes in the evening. Outstanding political activists are quickly absorbed into adult political party structures even if they do not begin as children of the ruling elite. At the same time, student activism allows for the expression of dissent that might be threatening in other forms, but which in the university environment often becomes a necessary means of importing new developments and aspirations from the industrialized centers of the world.

A PERUSAL of student literature and even of Latin American commentaries on U.S. student activities reveals similar language and even a similar delineation of issues. But whereas militant students in the United States and France are today questioning the value of imposing or even seeking a completely rational structure for society, Latin American students are still much closer to the optimism of the Enlightenment. This differ-

ence can be seen most clearly in the case of the machine. In the United States, many sectors of the student movement associate the machine, and the technological society it symbolizes, as readily with evil as with good. On occasion, as in the case of the air we breathe and the computer cards of the registrar's office, it seems as though everything has gone out of control and man is now servant to the machine. In Latin America, where the problems of underdevelopment and of the burdens of human labor are still very much in evidence, the machine is still the symbol of hope and progress, of man's control over nature and his limitless future, as it was for the older generation in the United States.

Differences in time and place alter perspectives on other apparently common issues as well. Anti-Communism seems to be increasingly seen as a stale political residue of a prior age. But whereas in the United States this has come as a gradual change from what had been a general consensus, in Latin America anti-Communism, although fervently supported by defenders of traditionalism, was never generally accepted as a dominant political myth among intellectuals. In underdeveloped countries, therefore, anti-Communism tends to confuse the rivalries of distant great powers with problems of local social and political change. As a result, today, while the new American left is still in the full flower of its discovery of the irrelevance of both Communism and anti-Communism, Latin American students have already moved beyond, after an interlude of Cuban-inspired guerrilla adventures, to a new political era.

This is best seen on issues of social justice. In the United States today, there is an element of urgency, even of threat and potential violence, associated with race and poverty. The universities are no longer immune. Events at Columbia had some echo in Harlem. Black student athletes are increasingly unwilling to be exploited in ways which offend their dignity and sense of solidarity. No such individual link for the transmission of tension between university and disadvantaged society exists in Latin America. The Indian peasant, by definition Latin America's traditional outsider, cannot attend a university. The son of an Indian peasant, should he matriculate, ceases by that very act to be either Indian or peasant. His new culture qualifies him racially as a mestizo just as surely as if he had, in the sixteenth century, bought a certificate from the King of Spain attesting to his lightness of skin. Simultaneously, his status as *universitario* automatically leads to absorption into the slowly expanding modern urban world,

and to an increasing separation from rural life. It is as if every time a Negro entered an American university, he literally turned white, and therefore could no longer belong to Negro society.

For a while, in the early days of *fidelismo*, violent revolution led by middle-class student activists seemed on the verge of successfully spanning the chasm between urban modernity and rural traditionalism. In country after country, between 1960 and 1963 and sporadically since then, students went out in an effort to set up rural guerrilla movements to emulate what they thought was the example set by Castro and Che Guevara. In country after country, unable even to communicate with the peasant populations among which they were moving, they were either wiped out, starved to death, or forced into ineffective undergrounds where they were kept alive for the purposes of international and national politics by forces with no interest in their cause.

The late Peruvian dramatist, Sebastián Salazar Bondy, once drew my attention to one of his students, whose fate symbolizes that terrible period. Javier Heraud was born the third child and second son of a successful lawyer in the Lima suburb of Miraflores. He studied first in a Jesuit primary school, then attended the expensive and exclusive Markham school where he excelled in sports and literature, graduating second in his class. While studying in the Faculty of Letters of the Catholic University in Lima, he also taught English in the public secondary schools. In 1960, he published a small book of poems, *The River*. The same year, he won first prize in the "Young Poet of Peru" competition sponsored by the magazine *Cuadernos Trimestrales de Poesía* of Trujillo (Peru). The prize collection was published the following year as *The Trip*. In 1962, the Peruvian Federation of Students (FEP) held a verse competition. Heraud's third book won the prize. Later that year, he left for Cuba on a government scholarship to study cinematography.

On May 3, 1963, he re-entered Peru clandestinely from Bolivia, by canoe, armed, in the company of six other students, apparently hoping to link up with Hugo Blanco's rapidly weakening attempts to organize peasant leagues among the Quechua Indians near Cuzco. On May 14, the small group of would-be guerrillas arrived, exhausted, in Puerto Maldonado—a border town of about 600—and checked into a small pension. Alerted to the arrival of strangers, a sergeant from the local guard post sought them out to ask for papers. When these were not in order, he asked the young men to accompany him to the station

house. On the way there was a scuffle and the sergeant was killed. The students fled for the river, pausing at the boardinghouse only long enough to pick up their guns. By nightfall, however, the youths had all been captured, with the exception of Javier Heraud, who was dead at twenty-one of wounds inflicted by dum-dum bullets from a local townsman's rifle.

THIS social isolation of the youthful quasi-elite in traditional society is very difficult to understand for the American with his images of equality and revolution. There is a great distance between the realization that conditions in Latin America fall short of these ideals and finding means for doing something about it. The silence of students today, however, stems less from repression or fear of death than from a lack of political optimism. Dozens of Indian languages and local subcultures are only the most obvious obstacles to effective national action. Not for nothing did Bolívar complain he had ploughed the sea. But even those who feel this is an unjust world, dominated by the United States with the complicity of the Soviet Union, suspect that to try to do something about it is likely only to make matters worse. The negative results of May in Paris—when the attempt to break the hold of General de Gaulle laid the basis for the political death of Pierre Mendès-France—were long ago perceived in Latin America. When all odds are against one, the only sane solution is to cultivate one's garden.

But is there a garden to cultivate? The perception of Latin America that is so common in the United States would suggest, rather, a state of deepening crisis with revolution around the corner. I suspect otherwise. When the establishment cannot be beaten, it is time to join it. And if there is no effective, modern establishment in Latin America, it must be built. Unlike the students of the industrialized northern hemisphere, who often seem nihilistic in their rejection of adults and the adult world, many students in Latin America seem to be seeking an outlet to an expanded modern world, even at the cost of accommodation with their elders.

Given some of the contemporary trends in the universities, the goals of the students may require only a moratorium on ideals, not their betrayal. Despite political turmoil and institutional rigidities, the old educational formula of "classics for aristocrats" has declined even in the historic public universities, where new faculties are turning out accountants, physicists, and members of other modern professions.

ALSO, since the beginning of the reform movement, the desire to avoid the political problems, penury, and resistance to change of the large national universities has contributed to the emergence of numerous new institutions which have served to diversify higher education and make it more relevant to Latin America's modern development. Technical schools, such as the military academies of Peru and Argentina, have been supplemented by new or expanded engineering universities, while Catholic universities have provided stability and occasional foreign contacts. During the last decade, there has been a virtual explosion of new institutions, including agricultural and technical schools, private nonsectarian universities for the wealthy, and even private medical and

business schools.

These changes in higher education reflect gradual economic changes as well as continuing political efforts to induce them. Latin American economies, though still hesitant and weak, are gradually building an industrial sector and modern agriculture alongside their traditional rural backwaters. The future will be determined less by those who sit in cafés providing copy for American journalists than by the increasing numbers of students who are preparing themselves to fill technical and non-elite functions in a future society whose coming no one questions. Whether, once that is achieved, the problems of future generations of Latin American students will become more like ours remains to be seen.

TIME

27 September 1968

MEXICO

Cause for the Rebels

Next month's Olympic games are the first to be held in a Spanish-speaking country, the first in Latin America, and the first in a developing nation. They are also Mexico's first big opportunity to put its stable prosperity on international display. A two-month-old strike by Mexico's normally docile university students is threatening to spoil that triumph. Last week President Gustavo Díaz Ordaz ordered the army to end the strike by taking over the National University campus on the outskirts of Mexico City.

The action shattered a 40-year tradition of university autonomy. As armored cars rumbled onto the almost-deserted campus, several thousand soldiers fanned out and arrested the first 500 students they could find. They also seized 34 professors. When other students demonstrated against the invasion, riot cops cracked down with billy clubs, tear gas and nausea gas, clapped another 500 demonstrators into jail. Thousands of students retreated to the campus of the huge Polytechnic School. They were so certain that the army would invade there, too, that they put up signs reading WELCOME, SOLDIERS.

Caught in the middle of the dispute, Javier Barros Sierra, the National University's respected rector, protested the government's "excessive use of force, which our institution did not deserve." He held no brief for the young rebels,

either. "Likewise," he said, "the university did not deserve the use made of it by some students and outside groups."

Four Demands. It was the second time the government had given its student rebels a cause. The riots started in July, when city *granaderos*, or riot cops, quelled a fight among prep-school boys and briefly occupied one of the school buildings. When the students protested, paratroopers moved in with tanks, armored cars and bazookas. They temporarily stopped the riots, but at the price of turning most of Mexico's students against them.

During two months of orderly demonstrations in Zocalo, the central plaza opposite Díaz Ordaz's mansion, the students made four demands: that the government disband the *granaderos*, dismiss Mexico City's police chief, release all so-called political prisoners, and revoke an antisubversion clause in the penal code. The government promised to re-examine the law, but otherwise remained aloof. Mexico's press blamed the riots on "Communist agitators," but the demonstrations seemed more to reflect the influence of an activist New Left. Increasingly, the students threatened to "stop the Olympics," and directed their attacks against Díaz Ordaz himself.

Amoeba with Food. The ruling Party of Republican Institutions (P.R.I.) also found itself under direct attack—something to which it is not accustomed. Some of the P.R.I.'s most powerful men were student rioters themselves in the revolution of 1910, but the party's

Approved For Release 2005/08/17 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000400030020-4

tolerance for dissent has withered markedly. When the opposition Party of National Action won two state elections last year, the government simply annulled the elections. "The P.R.I. doesn't know how to bend," said a foreign diplomat. "When it encounters an obstacle, it engulfs it, like an amoeba with a piece of food." But 58% of Mexico's population is now under 25, and while only a fraction of the youths are waving black and red flags, there are enough

sympathizers to make even a brobdignagian amoeba balk. In any case, whether the students demonstrate during the games or not, the sight of troops occupying the campus across from the Olympic stadium may well blight Mexico's proudest hour.

EL UNIVERSAL GRAFICO, Mexico City
2 August 1968

The 26th of July in Mexico

By Eduardo Arrieta

The youth that disrupted Mexico City were pushed by groups known to be interested in undermining order and national institutions. And whatever the pretext, the result is that these unscrupulous individuals create or provoke anarchy and threaten our sovereignty by means of any unthinking youthful disposition to clamour, tumult, agitation and to riot thinly disguised as vindication.

Here, apparently, it was all triggered by the insignificant circumstance of an inter-student dispute. Just as the meaningless objectives were lost in a sea of irrationalities, so were developments precipitated. Even then the government sustained interruption of transportation and disruption of capital life; thousands of residents, heads of family, employees, workers and students also, found to their dismay that they were prevented from meeting their obligations by the illegal conduct of the unruly youngsters who concentrated on stealing lorries, destroying shops, and in short, paralyzing the normal life of the city. The material losses suffered are enormous, and there aren't even enough records to make an approximate inventory of the losses. In terms of intellectual, cultural and international prestige, it is even less possible to estimate what has been lost by this formless movement. Aside from the apparent destruction in school and office buildings, it isn't known whether the vandalism has meant the loss of valuable papers indispensable to scholarly efforts.

It is obvious that there was a scheme to the disorders which were provoked. The advocates of subversion -- for that reason enemies of a country like Mexico that is trying to raise its standards by means of strength and work -- were expecting a chain reaction: after an unimportant souffle among students, police intervention; then the little understood but wounded student pride, the attack and ridicule against -- in this case, unpopular -- representatives of authority;

Approved For Release 2005/08/17 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000400030020-4

Approved For Release 2005/08/17 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000400030020-4
 consequently natural repression; finally the facts of blood, victims, banners, the "humanitarian" excuses with more violence, justice and legal strength, when what is really sought is disorder and disregard of the law, and the trampling of individual guarantees so that the unrest will produce weariness and the final crack-up of society.

There was, then, a plan. It is no mere coincidence that during these days one of the many groups of instigators of the chaos took part in the anniversary celebration of the extinct 26th of July Movement.

EL UNIVERSAL GRAFICO, Mexico City
 2 August 1968

"26 de Julio" en México

Por EDUARDO ARRIETA

Los jóvenes que perturbaron la ciudad de México, fueron empujados por grupos señalados que se interesan en dislocar el orden y las instituciones nacionales. Y cualquier pretexto resulta bueno para que estos descalificados individuos desaten o provoquen la anarquía, encimando sus nefastos designios contra nuestra soberanía en la irreflexiva disposición juvenil a la algarabía, al alboroto, a la agitación, al motín mal encubierto bajo el disfraz de supuestas vindicaciones.

Aquí, en apariencia, todo fue motivado por el insignificante hecho de una reyerta interestudiantil. Ya en cauce, y a medida que los objetivos anodinos se iban perdiendo en la marea de las inrazones, los acontecimientos se precipitaron. Aún allí, el gobierno soportó la dislocación del tránsito y la desarticulación de la vida capitalina; millares de habitantes, jefes de familia, empleados, obreros, estudiantes también, se vieron angustiosamente impedidos de cumplir con sus obligaciones por la conducta incivil de los muchachos caóticos que se dedicaron a secuestrar camiones, destruir comercios, paralizar, en fin, la vida normal de la ciudad. Los daños materiales que se produjeron son enormes, y aún no se tienen los datos suficientes para hacer un inventario aproximado de los mismos.

En otros órdenes —intelectual, cul-

tural, de prestigio internacional— menos es posible calcular lo que se ha perdido o se ha de perder por esta causa sin pies ni cabeza. Aparte de las destrucciones en los edificios escolares y comerciales, no se sabe si también el vandalismo desatado atentó contra la documentación valiosa e indispensable de los expedientes escolares.

Es obvio que hubo una programación en los desórdenes provocados. Los amigos de la subversión —por tanto enemigos de un país como México que está tratando de seguir elevándose mediante el esfuerzo y el trabajo— esperaban una reacción en cadena: después de una riña sin importancia entre alumnos, la intervención policiaca; después, el mal entendido orgullo estudiantil herido, el ataque y la burla a los —para esto sí impopulares—, representantes de la autoridad; en seguida, la natural represión; por último, los hechos de sangre, las víctimas, las banderas, los pretextos "humanitarios" para reclamar con más violencia, justicia y rigor de la ley, cuando lo que se busca es desorden y olvido de la ley, pisoteo de las garantías individuales para que el fermento produzca el cansancio y el estallido final de la sociedad.

Había, pues, un plan. No es mera coincidencia que en estos días uno de tantos grupos de azuzadores del caos adujera la celebración de un aniversario del extinto movimiento "26 de Julio".

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR
20 September 1968

Mexico's revolution, which began in 1910 and surged forward after 1930, has made the country one of the most stable and prosperous in Latin America. But now there are signs of unrest. New demands are being made which may herald yet another advance in the nearly 50-year-old revolution.

Restlessness in Mexico

By James Nelson Goodsell

*Latin America correspondent of
The Christian Science Monitor*



Mexico City

THIS ENIGMATIC LAND; LONG CONSIDERED Latin America's most stable nation, is showing signs of restlessness.

After nearly 40 years of political consensus, the prospect of major and perhaps serious dissent now faces the Mexican nation.

Just what such dissent means for Mexico's future and where it will lead is hard to tell. But the prospect is a very real one. Coming at the moment when Mexico is preparing to host the 1968 Olympic Games, it is a prospect that sends shivers through Mexico.

There are numerous signs of the restlessness—the most obvious, the mounting student movement.

For the past two months, university and high school students in Mexico City have carried on a variety of antigovernment demonstrations, even challenging Mexican President Diaz Ordaz himself.

Their protests list a host of "wrongs": official corruption, one-party rule, heavy-handed police tactics, and an oft-criticized judicial system.

Nation roused by challenge

The students brazenly, and successfully, took their antigovernment campaign right to the seat of government, the Zócalo, the central plaza of Mexico City which is almost always reserved for officially sponsored progovernment outpourings of support.

This very effective challenge roused this nation as few events have.

These student demonstrations raise the question of whether Mexico is as stable as many say it is and as the Mexican Government would have the world believe. The answer may not necessarily be a negative one, but the fact that the question is being raised is important.

As these words are being written, the student movement has so far failed to attract much visible support from other sectors of Mexican society. But this does not mean the students are without supporters or sympathy in Mexico.

In fact, the student challenge to authority here, if not their immediate cause, is appealing to many Mexicans who have grown tired of Mexico's one-party political system and its failure to make more rapid strides in solving the nation's problems.

Boosting the 'continuing revolution'

The system, which has allowed the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) to govern without much opposition, is a unique one. The PRI is actually a party of consensus. It has become a sort of umbrella embracing and representing diverse sectors of Mexican society. By some standards, such one-party rule would hardly seem democratic. Yet there are clearly some elements of democratic practice within the framework.

Actually the Mexican system has worked reasonably well over the years since the PRI was founded in the 1930's. Moreover, the system is credited quite correctly with helping Mexico achieve its present political peace and vigorous economic growth, while permitting a growing degree of social mobility, so uncommon to the rest of Latin America.

Wrapped up with the PRI is the concept of permanent revolution and change which is so much a part of modern Mexican politics. Virtually all political spokesmen, including President Diaz Ordaz, go to great efforts to ennoble the concept of a "continuing revolution."

Yet there are many parts of Mexican society which have not shared in this continuing revolution—at least the revolution and fought for its beginning in 1910 expected.

Approved For Release 2005/08/17 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000400030020-4

This is particularly true of rural Mexico. And it is in the countryside that the concept of continuing revolution is most vulnerable. There is grumbling in the countryside, and anyone who has traveled outside of Mexico City and other major metropolitan areas has heard the protests and complaints.

But this is often overlooked in Mexico City, which has developed a thriving middle class and which affords the social mobility that is necessary if Mexico is to lift itself out of the backwardness which characterized the pre-1910 period.

It may be that Mexico's growing social mobility is responsible for the current restlessness felt here.

"We're about to encounter the storm we've unleashed," comments one government official who adds that "in the long run I hope this will be a healthy development."

But whatever the reason, Mexico's current restlessness is very much a dominant factor in assessing this important nation as it hosts the Olympics.

Olympics visitors on the way

Hundreds of thousands of Olympics visitors are going to have a look at this dynamic Latin land, its achievements and advances — and its problems, including this new element in the picture. If present trends and performance continue as promised, there very well may be evidence of the youthful rebellion which is not confined to Mexico City alone, but stretches into at least half of Mexico's 24 states.

"Even if it is not openly visible and if the students are either persuaded or forced to suspend their protest, the most perceptive visitor will see that we are a people who are growing into political maturity and who want more mobility in politics," comments a PRI leader who says he has considerable sympathy for the student movement and its goals — "even those which go beyond the immediate scope of the student protest."

Like many other leaders in Mexico willing to comment on the country's political, economic, and social problems in more than general and often glowing terms, this official would not permit his name to be used. "It would be political suicide for me to allow my name to be used if I were quoted honestly and accurately," another leading government official said.

It is this very lack of political sophistication which is at the nub of real protest here.

A leading businessman with close connections with government and PRI officials said: "We're becoming aware that a new approach to politics is necessary. The student movement is simply a symptom of this recognition. Why do you think that Diaz Ordaz was so sympathetic to the students and the young people in his state of the nation address?"

Hard line — but with admissions

That was President Diaz Ordaz's Sept. 1 message, one hour of which was devoted to the student crisis in terms both tough and conciliatory. The President took a hard line on future student demonstrations, but seemed to admit much justification in the student protest.

In some ways, it is hard to assess the current trend of modern Mexico. Too little time has elapsed since the restlessness was first noted. And there are too many imponderables in the situation.

But the extent to which the latest manifestation of this uncertainty—the student protest—has shattered the Mexican calm is evidence of its importance to Mexico, its government, and its people.

This is an important nation, perhaps Latin America's most dynamic land. With a population of more than 45 million, it is the largest Spanish-speaking country, populationwise, in the world.

With a noble history dating well back into pre-Christian times, it boasts probably the most extensive Indian civilization of pre-European time in the new world. Its 10,000 archaeological sites support this claim.

And the overwhelming majority of Mexicans are descended in one way or another from this Indian background.

The modern Mexican is a mestizo—meaning a person of mixed Indian and Spanish or white background.

Fashioning a complex society

Out of a complex history, he has molded since 1910 a society that is just as mixed as his own background.

The year 1910 is important, for in a real way it marks the watershed of modern Mexican history. The nation's modern progress stems from that date when the old dictatorial regime of Porfirio Diaz was overthrown and a series of revolutionary governments, many of them ill-fated for their leaders, began.

It was not until the 1930's that the revolution began making real economic progress, but that was after the ground rules were laid down—including such goals as universal education, separation of church and state, one term for each president and a host of others.

In the process, Mexico developed a mixed economy with more socialist features than almost any other Latin American nation with the exception of Fidel Castro's Cuba, yet with a vigorous private enterprise system which continues to yield bountiful dividends to Mexicans and foreigners who invest. It has been a happy, although sometimes difficult, blending of the two.

And through it all more and more Mexicans have come to share in the national wealth, as industry and commerce developed and as the middle class has grown in numbers and strength.

Mexico's economic growth is yearly among the best in Latin America and usually the best—running currently at 7 percent per year. Mexico's peso is among the hard currencies of the world, used in many international loans and based on an enviable stable relationship with the United States dollar.

Poverty problem not all onesided

Although there are serious urban and rural poverty problems in Mexico with its burgeoning percent population increase (one of the highest in Latin America), there are relieving factors.

It is possible, for example, and indeed many hundreds of thousands of Mexicans are doing it, to move out of slum conditions in Mexico City into lower middle-class conditions within a lifetime—something that is virtually impossible in most other Latin lands.

This social mobility, of course, creates problems. And it is these problems which are showing up in today's restlessness.

"A nation does not advance and progress without problems," President Diaz Ordaz says.

His words are echoed by one of the students taking part in the current student movement. "Of course, we have gone ahead since the revolution," he says, "but this isn't enough. There is so much more to be done and we are becoming more aware of it because of what has already been done."

He might also have added that it is the burgeoning young population of Mexico that is calling for the increasing majority of

CPYRGHT

Mexicans. More than 60 percent of all Mexicans are under the age of 25. They are an increasingly vocal group and cannot be forgotten.

Students still lack major support

The students are for now a fairly independent unit, without much support from the urban workers and the rural campesinos. Yet the possibility that the movement will spread is very much with Mexico this Olympic year.

And it seems likely that the students, who are basically an idealistic group will continue in their quest to right the wrongs that still exist in Mexico so many years after its 1910 revolution.

That restlessness could be catching. And indeed there is evidence to suggest that it is far more widespread already than the limited student movement would lead the observer to believe.

Mexico's present challenge is really a twofold one: that of keeping up the revolution begun in 1910 and at the same time carrying it more effectively into areas where it has yet to reach. One of those areas may well be the breakup of the long-standing political consensus and its replacement over time with a more representative approach.

"We could be witnessing the initial phase of this," the PRI leader quoted before said. "It is hard to tell, however."

And indeed it is hard to guess what will be the outcome of the present restlessness here. What can be said is that it exists and that it is potentially explosive.

First of six articles

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR
26 September 1968

Díaz Ordaz faces call for change

By James Nelson Goodsell
Latin America correspondent of
The Christian Science Monitor

Mexico City

Some time next year Gustavo Díaz Ordaz, President of Mexico, will get around to one of the most important tasks of his six-year term: naming his own successor.

As things are played in Mexican politics, the incumbent president makes the choice, relying if he wants on the advice of a select circle of advisers which includes the living ex-presidents of Mexico. But the final analysis, the incumbent has the real say in the choice of his successor.

From the time Mr. Díaz Ordaz makes his choice known and the individual is then acclaimed, the script for the elections of 1970

MEXICO: new challenges 2

should be routine. The candidate will travel from the large cities of Mexico to the sparsely populated rural areas, campaigning against an opposition which has been unable in past elections to garner more than about 10 percent of the vote. And eventually, the Díaz Ordaz candidate, who will become a household name among Mexico's 46 million people, will win handily.

At least that is the script. But this time, Mexican politics may not work that way. The mounting protest in Mexico, far antedating this summer's student protest, is calling for a change in the script.

In the latest clash between police and students, Mexico City's granaderos (riot policemen) dispersed a crowd of more than 20,000 students late Tuesday with a barrage of tear-gas grenades. The students had gathered for a rally in the Plaza of Three Cultures near the Foreign Ministry building.

Elite criticized

The rally was called to protest Army occupation last Thursday of the National University of Mexico and the subsequent police take-over late Monday of the National Polytechnic Institute.

There were dozens of threats by students to march on the two schools and retake them by force.

Hospital reports of 15 killed in early Tuesday rioting near the National Polytechnic Institute were denied by police spokesmen. But students and others said deaths and injuries are far larger than the government admits. The police say three were killed in the latest incidents.

The student protest, which some observers here say could upset plans for the Olympic Games which open here Oct. 12, is obviously a concern to officials here. Moreover, it is seen as part of the growing call for changes in Mexico's political system.

And leaders of Mexico's dominant single party, the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) are aware that there is clamor for change in the system.

No one here expects the Partido de Acción Nacional (PAN), the leading opposition movement, to seriously threaten the long PRI hegemony in Mexico's presidential palace. But there is growing likelihood of changes within the PRI itself.

The PRI, which embraces both the far Left and the far Right in a loose amalgam, unlike any other political body in the world, is actually based on three sectors of Mexican society—labor, farm, and popular. The idea is that the PRI provides a political haven for all elements within Mexican society.

Formed out of the diverse and often warring elements of the Mexican Revolution which began in 1910 and continued into the 1930's, the PRI was designed to bring these elements together and use the talent of all for common goals. It was a valid vision—and has worked relatively well.

Even the PRI's most ardent critics give the political party good marks for filling a political need in earlier years and for providing Mexico with a political peace which has made possible its economic progress and social mobility.

But the criticism of the PRI at this time, to say nothing about the criticism of its whole political structure, centers on a feeling that the PRI is no longer in tune with the times, that although a party of consensus it does not represent the biggest element in society, the youth of the nation.

Moreover, criticism centers on the ruling elite within the PRI—the former presidents and a small number of close advisers who actually dictate the course of PRI politics and in turn the course of Mexico. And there is also a sizable body of critics who note that opposition groups such as PAN do not have much opportunity to grow, that they are outside the patronage system and the ballot-counting arrangements, and therefore have little prospect of any immediate victories of consequence in state and local polls, to say nothing of the national election. The PRI has grown increasingly conservative in the years since it was formed. Although its initial party platforms called for radical economic and social reforms—

including such as the nationalization of the oil fields, an action which was carried out by Lázaro Cardenas in the 1930's—the party is clearly to the right of center.

Stability defended

The PRI has for so long dominated Mexican politics that the thought of change brings worry not only to PRI supporters but also to those who basically want some alteration of the political system.

"The system has been good for Mexico's progress," says a PRI official, who admits the possibility is growing that the system may have to be changed somewhat "to bring us into accord with the times."

Yet no one in the PRI, the broad umbrella embracing virtually all of the political rainbow here, expects or much less wants any vigorous change which would seriously alter the PRI's dominance in federal, state, and local elections.

"They've got too much going for them," comments a longtime foreign resident who says the PRI will not give up its dominance easily. More important than the offices won by PRI candidates is the question of patronage which has grown markedly over the years. Much of the PRI's ability to keep winning elections is based on this issue, for if the PRI were to lose an election in one of the states, the whole system of patronage would fall away.

Tampering charged

PAN and several smaller parties say they have won elections in the northern states of Chihuahua and Sonora and in the southeastern Yucatán Peninsula. And a few PAN office-seekers actually have taken over mayor posts, and other small offices in the outlying areas of Mexico. But PAN leaders say that while they have won elsewhere, the Mexican Government has altered the ballot boxes and brought about a PRI win.

Still, on balance, there are more PAN members in office today than five years ago—and the number is growing slowly.

For some time, observers felt that change, if it were to come in Mexico's political structure, would come through the slow rise of opposition political parties.

It probably will be a factor, but the possibility of change within the PRI is even more discussed as likely in the wake of the mounting restlessness evident in Mexican society today.

Industry developed

Mr. Cardenas was probably the last valid radical in the presidency, although there is even thought in some quarters that he was not as radical a President as his image suggests. Today, although the presidents since then have often been tagged liberals, the idea of a strongly mixed economy in which both the private and public sectors commingle is the key to political philosophy.

Mexico has capitalized on its closeness to

the United States, attracting industry and tourism in growing proportions. The nation is becoming industrialized and with this has come a new class of middle-income workers who like the prosperity of the nation and want to keep it that way. The PRI in some ways seems best designed to keep things going in this fashion.

The PRI's three-pronged base of labor, farm, and popular sectors is wearing a little thin, however. Wages in Mexico have not increased sharply in the past 20 years following the immediate post World War II rises, thus providing investors with a cheap labor source.

Farm lag cited

The farm scene is not a very healthy one. The Revolution of 1910 was designed to further the forgotten man in Mexico, the rural campesino. But his lot in many instances is little better than it was in 1910. Some opponents of the PRI and of the present trend in Mexico say that the government has been more interested in building a new urban class and has consequently forgotten the rural side.

PRI officials seem to admit some validity in the criticism. And President Díaz Ordaz has worked during the first four years of his tenure to place more emphasis on the agrarian side of society.

But outside of the PRI's three-pronged base is the mounting force of youth which has made itself felt in Mexico during this past summer of discontent. The student strike, with its demands for certain changes, however, has not gotten at the root of student discontent, which in its basic form is a challenge to the system, to the PRI, and to the whole fabric of Mexico's political arrangements.

This undoubtedly will come later. And it will probably be the challenge facing the man President Díaz Ordaz taps next year to be his successor.

At present, the leading candidate appears to be Mexico City's industrious and hard-working Mayor, Alfonso Corona del Rosal. A longtime associate of President Díaz Ordaz, Mr. Corona del Rosal has many credentials for the office—a longtime service within PRI ranks, ability, and political savvy.

Yet he has opposition—from the students, who have linked him with the police and Army brutality exemplified in the initial police-student clashes of late July; from within PRI ranks where there is much jockeying for political power; and from Luis Echeverría, Minister of Government (handling internal security and other activities), who has supporters pushing his name.

Second of six articles

Mexico's growth rate paces Latin America

By James Nelson Goodsell
 Latin America correspondent of
 The Christian Science Monitor

MEXICO: new challenges 3

Mexico City

With continuing economic growth rates above 6 percent per year, Mexico has become a pacesetter for Latin America. And, since 1945, it has led the Latin-speaking Americas in economic progress and social advancement.

In some ways, as a banker here said this past summer, "Mexico is the example upon which the somewhat floundering Alliance for Progress ought to pattern."

That statement probably overstates the case. For even the good growth-rate figures shown in recent statistics do not tell the whole story, and there are signs on the horizon that all is not as rosy as the indications suggest.

Yet there is a good, solid economic growth here—keeping well ahead of the more than 3 percent increase in population registered each year in this nation of 46 million people. And the record indicates the role of Mexico in setting the pace for the rest of the hemisphere.

The Ministry of Industry and Commerce recently announced that figures for the first five months of 1968 suggest that the Mexican economy will perform better this year than in 1967 when the gross national product increased 6.4 percent.

The good 1968 record includes significant gains in manufactured items, although it does reflect some decline in both agriculture and in tourism.

There is also the added factor of inflationary pressures. Mexico's dynamic growth picture fans these pressures. The price index for 1967 rose 2.9 percent, which is more than double the index for 1966. And, early indications for 1968 suggest this year's total may well be much higher, perhaps in the 4 or 5 percent bracket.

One hears more often than before a clamor from the affected sectors—the housewife who watches the food bill increase and the salaried individual who is on a fixed income. Food prices in 1967 rose 4.4 percent compared to 2 percent in 1966. What the 1968 figure will be is unclear. But there have been sharp food-price increases this past six or seven months.

Overall the current business and industry situation here is not quite as hopeful as it was a year ago. Credit in this Olympic year has become tighter with little prospect

of a major relief in the government's effort to keep down inflationary pressures.

It is generally believed that the growth in 1968 will come more from the private sector than from the government and that this growth will keep the gross national product rising at a near 7 percent during the year.

Effect probed

But how long this growth can be sustained remains an open question.

Mexican businessmen are aware of the question and the problems it implies. But lest the cautionary signs be taken as a storm warning, these businessmen as well as government officials and economic analysts think that many of the immediate threats to economic expansion are only short-range items and that they are offset by the nation's continuing impetus for expansion.

In short, the long run looks much better than cautionary signs on the horizon might indicate.

Still, the effect of the student disorders of this past summer is hard to gauge. Much physical damage has been done to parts of Mexico City—several million dollars worth in broken windows, burned-out buses, and defacement of public works.

And there is also the factor of the loss to the nation in student development during the months that the schools have been closed by the student strike.

Moreover, the student activity is continuing. And there is no indication of it slowing down. With the Olympics almost here, there is concern over what the student unrest will do the image of a stable nation that Mexico puts forth and which has been fairly accurate.

Tourists do not want to visit a nation that presents a picture of upheaval and turmoil. And with the Olympics at hand, to have a large segment of the nation unhappy and demonstrating is an upsetting factor. It is bound to have an impact on tourism, which is a major sector of the economy.

Mexico relies upon the tourist spending, particularly in dollars, to compensate for the traditional deficit in the balance of trade.

Putting aside the impact of the student disorders, the picture is still not too good.

CPYRGH
T

Tourism increased in the first three months by only 1.1 percent. There have been some complaints by storeowners and hotelmen that while the number of tourists, particularly from the United States, is increasing, the tourists are spending less. The 1.1 percent boost in tourist spending compares with a growth of 18.6 percent during the first three months of 1967.

In this connection, new stress apparently is going to be given to tourism in the months ahead. During the summer, a convention on tourism was held in San Luis Potosí and at the same time the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank both announced credits totaling almost \$16 million for a variety of tourist projects.

One of the solutions to the slowing in tourism earnings is a campaign to get Mexicans to stay at home—to spend their pesos at home rather than abroad, particularly in the United States.

This solution is regarded as important, for although the number of Mexicans who go abroad is smaller than the number of foreigners who come to Mexico, the Mexican abroad spends more than does the visitor to this land. The average Mexican spends about \$1,000, while the average foreigner here spends only \$225.

Third of six articles